

No. 9(1)-81-6Lab./14984.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Dharam Pal Chaddha and Sons G. T. Road, Bhiwani.

**BEFORE SHRI BANWARI LAL DALAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
ROHTAK**

**Reference No. 9 of 1979**

*between*

**SHRI P. N. SHARMA, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S DHARAM PAL CHADDHA AND SONS, G.T. ROAD BAHALGARH (SONEPAT).**

**Present : —**

None from either side.

**AWARD**

This reference has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor,—*vide* Order No. ID/SPT 964, dated 6th January, 1979 under section 10(1)(c) of the I. D. Act for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri P. N. Sharma, workman and the management of M/s Dharam Pal Chaddha and Sons Bahalgarh. The term of the reference was :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri P. N. Sharma was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On the receipt of the order of reference notices as usual were sent to the parties. The parties appeared in response to the same filed their respective pleadings and issues as per reference was framed on the basis of the pleas of the parties. The management was asked to adduce their evidence. *Ex parte* proceedings were held against the workman when no one appeared on his behalf on 2nd August, 1979. Shri Suresh Chaddha and Shri Sat Pal were examined as management witness in *ex parte* proceedings. From their statements it is established that the workman was appointed on trial basis and worked for 15 days from 28th August, 1978 to 12th September, 1978 and took advance of Rs. 110 on 30th August, 1978 and Rs 100 on 12th September, 1978,—*vide* vouchers Exhibit mark A and Mark B. The entries were made in the cash book. The photo copies of relevant entries are Ex. M.W. 2/1 and M.W. 2/2. After 12th September, 1978, the workman did not report for duty and also his services were terminated as his work was not found satisfactory.

I have no reason to disbelieve the statements of the management witness; particularly when the workman did not care of in pursuing his demand leading to this reference. Relying on their statements I hold that the termination of the services of the workman was justified and in order. The workman is not entitled to any relief. This reference is answered and returned accordingly.

**BANWARI LAL DALAL,**

Dated 12th December, 1981

Presiding Officer,

Labour Court Haryana, Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 4322, dated 17th December, 1981

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the I. D. Act.

**BANWARI LAL DALAL,**

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court Haryana, Rohtak.